APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/821,687	04/09/2004	F. Soner Terek	MSFT-2955/307064.01	1355

41505   7590   05/12/2009
WOODCOCK WASHBURN LLP (MICROSOFT CORPORATION)
CIRA CENTRE, 12TH FLOOR
2929 ARCH STREET
PHILADELPHIA, PA 19104-2891

EXAMINER
COLAN, GIOVANNA B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2162	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
05/12/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/821,687	TEREK ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	GIOVANNA COLAN	2162	

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>24 February 2009</u>.

2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) <u>38, 40-49, 54-55, and 57 – 58</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) <u>38, 40-55, 54-55, and 57 – 58</u> is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:

      1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This action is issued in response to the Amendment filed on 02/24/2009.

2.   Claims 38, 40-49, 54-55, and 57-58 were amended. Claims 1-37, 39, 50-53, and

56 were canceled. No claims were added.

3.   This action is made Final.

4.   Claims 38, 40-49, 54-55, and 57 – 58 are pending in this application.

Response to Arguments

5.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 38, 40-49, 54-55, and 57 – 58 have

been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of

the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of

the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein

were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation

under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was

not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to

consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g)

prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

7.   Claims 38, 44, and 58 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Bennion (U.S. Patent No. 5,634,123) in view of Grosner et al.

(Grosner hereinafter) (2004/0078467).

        Regarding claim 38, Bennion teaches a computer readable medium bearing a

computer readable representation … comprising:

        a plurality of fragments representing the plurality of objects the plurality of

fragments (Fig. 2, item 201, Col. 7, lines 7 – 10, Bennion) including:

                at least a binary fragment (Fig. 2, item 201, Col. 7, lines 7 – 10, Bennion)

associated with an object, each binary fragment comprising a binary fragment header

and a binary fragment payload (col. 1, lines 56-60, "The data structure defined by the

present invention includes two types of records: data-containing records and container

records. Data-containing records contain data, while container records contain other

records. A code point found at the beginning of each record specifies its type", wherein

a code point is equivalent to a header and one of the types is data-containing records,

in which case the header is a binary fragment header; Figure 2, element 205, wherein

the Data portion is equivalent to the payload, Bennion[1]), wherein the binary fragment

payload includes a plurality of primitive data members of the associated object (col. 3,

lines 19-22, wherein the "Company" (Figure 6, item 603, Bennion) corresponds to the

object claimed; and also since "COMPANY DATA 601" is a data-containing record that

contains data only (not other records), Bennion), and wherein the binary fragment

payload is devoid of any non-primitive members of the associated object (Fig. 6, item

601, Col. 3, lines 19 – 27, "…Container records contain other records, while data-

containing records contain data. No record is both container record and a data-

containing record…"; wherein the Examiner interprets that since item 601 "COMPANY

DATA", Fig. 6, does not contain other records, as opposed to "REGION 602", then it is

devoid of any non-primitive member as claimed, Bennion[2]), and wherein the binary

fragment header comprises a type field including a number of fragment property bits

including a member type bit indicating if all members are primitives (col. 1, lines 56-60,

"The data structure defined by the present invention includes two types of records: data-

containing records and container records. Data-containing records contain data, while

container records contain other records. A code point found at the beginning of each

record specifies its type.", Bennion).

---

[1] Wherein the "Company" (Figure 6, item 603, Bennion) corresponds to the object claimed.
[2] Examiner makes note that the specification provides examples of "primitive members", (specification of the disclosure; [0006], "string", "integer") also as defined by the dictionary ("Academic Press Dictionary of Science and Technology from Elsevier Science & Technology, Copyright 1992, 1996 by Academic Press") Primitive is a fundamental unit that cannot be divided. Therefore, data (in a data-containing record which does NOT contain other records) is of a primitive data type. See also, figure 3, Bennion, first block of data starting from the left on "151-200", the payload "DATA" includes "123 Avenue "E" " which are string and integers. Examiner has interpreted the claims in light of the specification. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

However, Bennion does not expressly disclose a self-terminating bit. On the other hand, Grosner does disclose: a self-terminating bit indicating if the associated object is represented within one fragment ([0699], Grosner). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Bennion by incorporating the self-terminating bit, in the same conventional manner as disclosed by Grosner. Skilled artisan would have found it motivated to use such a modification in order to provide load balanced (see: [0026], Grosner).

Furthermore, the combination of Bennion in view of Grosner (Bennion/Grosner hereinafter) discloses:

at least one additional fragment comprising at least one member of an object (See at least col. 1, lines 56-60, "The data structure defined by the present invention includes two types of records: data-containing records and container records. Data-containing records contain data, while container records contain other records. A code point found at the beginning of each record specifies its type"; Figure 3, and col. 6, lines 5-18, wherein "a sample string of data bytes representing a series of hierarchically-organized records" illustrates a fragment comprising non-primitive members of the object, Bennion), the additional fragment including an additional field describing the at least one non-primitive member by including at least one attribute of the non-primitive member (Figure 2.; col. 1, lines 60-62, "A length field facilitates variable data lengths for data-containing records", Bennion).

Claim 44 is rejected for the reasons set forth hereinabove for claim 38 and furthermore Bennion/Grosner discloses a computer readable storage medium comprising a terminator fragment that marks the end of the object, said terminator fragment comprising a terminator type field indicating the terminator fragment is a terminator fragment (col. 6, lines 40-42, Bennion).

Claim 58 is rejected on grounds corresponding to the reasons given above for claim 38.

8.   Claims 40-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bennion (U.S. Patent No. 5,634,123), in view of Grosner et al. (Grosner hereinafter) (2004/0078467), in view of Krishnaprasad et al, "Krishnaprasad" (U.S. Publication No. 2004/0220946), and further in view of Sarkar (U.S. Patent No. 6,012,067).

Claim 40 is rejected for the reasons set forth hereinabove for claim 38. However, Bennion/Grosner does not explicitly disclose a fragment comprising Large Object (LOB) fragment.

Krishnaprasad discloses a computer readable storage medium comprising:

at least one Large Object (LOB) fragment comprising a LOB fragment header (page 5, section [0062], "Message 300 includes four fields: a length field 302; a version field 304; a flag field 306; and a payload field 310. The combination of fields 302, 304, 306, 310 composes a serialized image of XML data, according to the illustrated

embodiment", wherein the fields except the payload field are considered to be the header portion) and a LOB fragment payload (page 6, section [0066], "Payload field 310 includes serialized XML data for a particular XML construct"),

wherein the LOB header comprises a LOB type field, wherein the LOB type field indicates the LOB fragment is a LOB fragment (page 6, section [0066], "If the flag field 306 indicates that the type is LOB, then a locator for the LOB appears in the payload, such as the octal string "0.times.000030303030303- 0 . . . "), and a LOB length field, wherein the LOB length field indicates a length of the LOB fragment payload (page 5, section [0063], "Length field 302 includes data that indicates the length of the serialized image. Any method known in the art for indicating length may be used."; Page 6, TABLE 2).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate a LOB fragment structure as disclosed by Krishnaprasad into the computer readable representation as disclosed in Bennion/Grosner so that an XML element may be transferred between processes 132a and 132b, which both have access to LOB 144b, by passing the LOB locator (page 4, section [0047]). One of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to make the aforementioned combination with reasonable expectation of success.

However, the combination of Bennion in view of Grosner and further in view of Krishnaprasad (Bennion/Grosner/Krishnaprasad hereinafter) does not explicitly disclose a value type field that indicates whether the LOB fragment payload comprises an inline LOB or a pointer to a LOB location.

Sarkar teaches a value type field, wherein the value type field indicates whether the LOB fragment payload comprises an inline LOB or a pointer to a LOB location (col. 4, lines 25-33, "Internal LOB columns contain LOB locators that can refer to out-of-line or inline LOB values. Selecting a LOB column value returns the LOB locator and not the entire LOB value. Different operations in the form of packages and functions are performed through these locators. Multiple LOB data type columns can be defined in a table and all possible SQL operations are possible over such tables and attributes. LOB locator can be stored in the table column, either with or without the actual LOB value").

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate a value type field, as disclosed by Sarkar, into the computer readable representation as disclosed in the Bennion/Grosner/Krishnaprasad so that when a LOB column value is selected, the LOB locator is first returned instead of the entire LOB value (col. 4, lines 27-28). One of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to make the aforementioned combination with reasonable expectation of success.

Claim 41 is rejected for the reasons set forth hereinabove for claim 40 and furthermore the combination of Bennion in view of Grosner in view of Krishnaprasad and further in view of Sarkar (Bennion/Grosner/Krishnaprasad/Sarkar hereinafter) discloses a computer readable storage medium wherein the LOB fragment payload comprises a LOB (col. 4, lines 25-33, Sarkar).

Claim 42 is rejected for the reasons set forth hereinabove for claim 40 and

furthermore Bennion/Grosner/Krishnaprasad/Sarkar discloses a computer readable

storage medium wherein the LOB fragment payload comprises a pointer to a LOB

location (col. 4, lines 25-33, Sarkar).

Claim 43 is rejected for the reasons set forth hereinabove for claim 40 and

furthermore Bennion/Grosner/Krishnaprasad/Sarkar discloses a computer readable

storage medium wherein the value type field indicates whether the LOB fragment

payload comprises an inline LOB, a pointer to a LOB location, or a cell reference (col. 4,

lines 25-33; col. 5, lines 18-47, Sarkar).

9.   Claims 45-48 and 55-57 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Bennion (U.S. Patent No. 5,634,123), in view of Grosner et al.

(Grosner hereinafter) (2004/0078467), and further in view of Stickler (US Patent No.

6,904,454 B2).

Claim 45 is rejected for the reasons set forth hereinabove for claim 38 and

furthermore Bennion/Grosner discloses a computer readable storage medium wherein

said at least one additional fragment comprises:

a collection start fragment comprising a collection start header (col. 1, lines 56-

60, "The data structure defined by the present invention includes two types of records:

data-containing records and container records. Data-containing records contain data,

while container records contain other records. **A code point found at the beginning of**

each record specifies its type", wherein the fragment indicating the code element corresponds to the collection start fragment as claimed; also Examiner makes note that Bennion's code point is at the beginning of each record; therefore, the code is a collection start fragment as claimed; Bennion[3]),

wherein the collection start header comprises a collection start type field, wherein the collection start type field indicates the collection start fragment is a collection start fragment (Col. 1, lines 56 - 63, "The data structure defined by the present invention includes two types of records: data-containing records and container records. Data-containing records contain data, while container records contain other records. **A code point found at the beginning of each record specifies its type**. A length field facilitates variable data lengths for data-containing records, as well as implicit definition of a hierarchical structure among records", wherein container records are equivalent to "collection". "… a hierarchical structure among records…" indicates the structure of a collection type record; col. 5, lines 18-20, "**One bit is used to indicate that this is a container record** (as opposed to a data-containing record)") indicate that this is a container record (as opposed to a data-containing record)", Bennion[4]), and

a plurality of collection element fragments (See at least col. 1, lines 56 – 63; Figure 3, and col. 6, lines 5-18).

---

[3] Also see, Col. 6, lines 12 – 16, Bennion, "In the code points shown, the first byte is CO for container records ...". As also shown in Figure 3, first row 1 – 50, Bennion, the "CP" (code point) is always at the start of the blocks of data. For example, first block CP=CONT with LEN=302, second block CP=CONT with LEN=98, third block CP...etc.

[4] Also see, Col. 6, lines 12 – 16, Bennion, "In the code points shown, the first byte is CO for container records ...". As also shown in Figure 3, first row 1 – 50, Bennion, the "CP" (code point) is always at the start of the blocks of data. For example, first block CP=CONT with LEN=302, second block CP=CONT with LEN=98, third block CP...etc.

However, Bennion/Grosner does not explicitly disclose a bit field, wherein the bit

field indicates whether an order exists among a plurality of collection element

fragments.

Stickler, on the other hand, discloses a bit field, wherein the bit field indicates

whether an order exists among a plurality of collection element fragments (Col. 1 and

17, lines 56 – 58 and 45 – 47; respectively, "at least one entity includes metadata that

identifies a sequential relationship between one or more entities within the scope of said

one entity, each of said entities including metadata defining a position within said

sequential relationship", wherein the one entity that identifies a sequential relationship

(i.e. order of entities) corresponds to the bit field that indicates whether an order exists

among collection element fragments as claimed, Stickler). It would have been obvious

to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the

teachings of Bennion/Grosner by incorporating a bit field indicating whether an order

exists as disclosed by Stickler among a plurality of collection element fragments, to

overcome a difficult situation present in known tree-based versioning models namely

their inability to explicitly define relationships between different releases (col. 2, lines 1-

5). Furthermore, MARS 25 also provides encoding properties defining special qualities

relating to the format, structure or general serialization of data streams (col. 10, lines

16-18). One of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to make the aforementioned

combination with reasonable expectation of success.

Claim 46 is rejected for the reasons set forth hereinabove for claim 45 and furthermore the combination of Bennion in view of Grosner and further in view of Stickler (Bennion/Grosner/Stickler hereinafter) discloses a medium comprising:

at least one collection element fragment comprising a collection element header and collection element payload (col. 1, lines 56-60, "The data structure defined by the present invention includes two types of records: data-containing records and container records. Data-containing records contain data, while container records contain other records. A code point found at the beginning of each record specifies its type"; col. 5, lines 18-20, "One bit is used to indicate that this is a container record (as opposed to a data-containing record)", wherein a code point is equivalent to a header and one of the types is container records, in which case the header is a collection element header because container records contain other records, which is equivalent to a "collection" element, and the data itself is the payload, Bennion),

wherein the collection element header comprises a collection element type field and a collection element length field, wherein the collection element type field indicates the collection element fragment is a collection element fragment (col. 5, lines 18-20, "One bit is used to indicate that this is a container record (as opposed to a data-containing record)", Bennion), and

wherein the collection element length field indicates the length of the collection element payload (col. 5, lines 23-25, "For container records, the length field 203 specifies the total length of all records that the current record contains (as described above)", Bennion).

Claim 47 is rejected for the reasons set forth hereinabove for claim 46, and furthermore Bennion/Grosner/Stickler discloses a computer readable storage medium wherein the collection element payload comprises a data member in a collection of data members corresponding to said collection start fragment (col. 3, lines 32-43, Bennion).

Claim 48 is rejected for the reasons set forth hereinabove for claim 46, and furthermore Bennion/Grosner/Stickler discloses a computer readable storage medium wherein

the collection element header further comprises a collection element locator field that provides a unique location of a data member in a collection of data members (col. 4, lines 24-31, Bennion).

Claim 55 is rejected on grounds corresponding to the reasons given above for claims 45 and 46.

Claim 57 are rejected on grounds corresponding to the reasons given above for claims 47 and 48.

10.   Claims 49 and 54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bennion (U.S. Patent No. 5,634,123), in view of Grosner et al. (Grosner hereinafter) (2004/0078467), in view of Krishnaprasad et al, "Krishnaprasad" (U.S.

Publication No. 2004/0220946), in view of Sarkar (U.S. Patent No. 6,012,067), and

further in view of Stickler (US Patent No. 6,904,454 B2).

With respect to claim 49, Bennion teaches a computer readable storage medium

bearing a computer readable representation … comprising:

a plurality of fragments representing the plurality of objects the plurality of

fragments (Fig. 2, item 201, Col. 7, lines 7 – 10, Bennion) including:

a collection start fragment associated with an object, each collection start

fragment comprising a collection start header (col. 1, lines 56-60, "The data structure

defined by the present invention includes two types of records: data-containing records

and container records. Data-containing records contain data, while container records

contain other records. A code point found at the beginning of each record specifies its

type", wherein container records are equivalent to "collection". A code point is

equivalent to the start header, Bennion),

wherein the collection start header comprises a collection start type field, wherein

the collection start type field includes a number of fragment bits including a member

type bit indicating that the collection start fragment is a collection start fragment (col. 1,

lines 56 - 63, "The data structure defined by the present invention includes two types of

records: data-containing records and container records. Data-containing records contain

data, while container records contain other records. A code point found at the beginning

of each record specifies its type. A length field facilitates variable data lengths for data-

containing records, as well as implicit definition of a hierarchical structure among

records", wherein container records are equivalent to "collection". A code point is

equivalent to the start header. "a hierarchical structure among records" indicates the

structure of a collection type record; col. 5, lines 18-20, "One bit is used to indicate that

this is a container record (as opposed to a data-containing record)", Bennion).

However, Bennion does not expressly disclose a self-terminating bit. On the

other hand, Grosner does disclose: a self-terminating bit indicating if the associated

object is represented within one fragment ([0699], Grosner). It would have been

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify

Bennion by incorporating the self-terminating bit, in the same conventional manner as

disclosed by Grosner. Skilled artisan would have found it motivated to use such a

modification in order to provide load balanced (see: [0026], Grosner).

Furthermore, Bennion/Grosner discloses:

the plurality of collection element fragments (See at least col. 1, lines 56 – 63;

Figure 3, and col. 6, lines 5-18, Bennion) associated with said collection start fragment

(Fig. 3, Col. 6, lines 5 – 15, "...the first byte is CO for container records...", Bennion),

wherein each of the plurality of collection element fragments comprises a collection

element header and a collection element payload, and wherein each collection payload

comprises a data member of a collection element data type (Col. 5 and 6, lines 5 – 13

and 9 – 15; respectively, Bennion), said collection element data type comprising data of

same type as every collection element associated with said collection start fragment

(Col. 3 and 6, lines 19 – 24 and 9 – 16; "No record is both a container record and a

data-containing record..." and "...and 'DATA' is data field. In the code points shown, the

first byte is CO for container records…"; respectively, wherein the first byte CO indicates

that the data is of same type, such as, container record, Bennion).

However, Bennion/Grosner does not explicitly disclose a fragment comprising

Large Object (LOB) fragment and nor does Bennion/Grosner explicitly disclose a bit

field, wherein the bit field indicates whether an order exists among a plurality of

collection element fragments.

Krishnaprasad discloses a computer readable storage medium bearing …

representation … comprising:

at least one Large Object (LOB) fragment associated with an object, each LOB

fragment comprising a LOB fragment header (page 5, section [0062], "Message 300

includes four fields: a length field 302; a version field 304; a flag field 306; and a

payload field 310. The combination of fields 302, 304, 306, 310 composes a serialized

image of XML data, according to the illustrated embodiment", wherein the fields except

the payload field are considered to be the header portion) and a LOB fragment payload

(page 6, section [0066], "Payload field 310 includes serialized XML data for a particular

XML construct", Krishnaprasad),

wherein the LOB fragment header comprises a LOB type field, wherein the LOB

type field includes a number of fragment bits including a member type bit indicating that

the LOB fragment is a LOB fragment (page 6, section [0066], "If the flag field 306

indicates that the type is LOB, then a locator for the LOB appears in the payload, such

as the octal string "0.times.000030303030303- 0 . . . ", Krishnaprasad),

and a bit indicating if the LOB fragment is the first fragment of a plurality of

fragments representing the associated object ([0064], lines 5 – 7, Krishnaprasad);

and a LOB length field, wherein the LOB length field indicates a length of the

LOB fragment payload (page 5, section [0063], "Length field 302 includes data that

indicates the length of the serialized image. Any method known in the art for indicating

length may be used."; Page 6, TABLE 2, Krishnaprasad).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to incorporate a LOB fragment structure as disclosed by

Krishnaprasad into the computer readable representation as disclosed in

Bennion/Grosner so that an XML element may be transferred between processes 132a

and 132b, which both have access to LOB 144b, by passing the LOB locator (page 4,

section [0047]). One of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to make the

aforementioned combination with reasonable expectation of success.

However, Bennion/Grosner/Krishnaprasad does not explicitly disclose a value

type field that indicates whether the LOB fragment payload comprises an inline LOB or

a pointer to a LOB location, nor a bit field, wherein the bit field indicates whether an

order exists among a plurality of collection element fragments. Sarkar teaches a value

type field, wherein the value type field indicates whether the LOB fragment payload

comprises an inline LOB or a pointer to a LOB location (col. 4, lines 25-33, "Internal

LOB columns contain LOB locators that can refer to out-of-line or inline LOB values.

Selecting a LOB column value returns the LOB locator and not the entire LOB value.

Different operations in the form of packages and functions are performed through these

locators. Multiple LOB data type columns can be defined in a table and all possible SQL

operations are possible over such tables and attributes. LOB locator can be stored in

the table column, either with or without the actual LOB value", Sarkar). It would have

been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made

to incorporate a value type field, as disclosed by Sarkar, into the computer readable

representation as disclosed in the Bennion/Grosner/Krishnaprasad so that when a LOB

column value is selected, the LOB locator is first returned instead of the entire LOB

value (col. 4, lines 27-28, Sarkar). One of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to

make the aforementioned combination with reasonable expectation of success.

 However, Bennion/Grosner/Krishnaprasad/Sarkar does not explicitly disclose a

bit field, wherein the bit field indicates a property of a collection in one of a plurality of

collection element fragments, wherein the bit field further indicates whether an order

exists among the plurality of collection element fragments. Stickler discloses a bit field,

wherein the bit field indicates a property of a collection in one of a plurality of collection

element fragments (Col. 7, lines 40 – 49, and Col. 17, lines 45 – 47, Stickler), wherein

the bit field further indicates whether an order exists among the plurality of collection

element fragments (col. 1, lines 56-58, "at least one entity includes metadata that

identifies a sequential relationship between one or more entities within the scope of said

one entity, each of said entities including metadata defining a position within said

sequential relationship", wherein the one entity that identifies a sequential relationship

(i.e. order of entities) is analogous to the bit field that indicates whether an order exists

among collection element fragments as claimed, Stickler). It would have been obvious

to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate a

bit field indicating whether an order exists as disclosed by Stickler among a plurality of

collection element fragments, as disclosed in Bennion/Grosner/Krishnaprasad/Sarkar,

to overcome a difficult situation present in known tree-based versioning models namely

their inability to explicitly define relationships between different releases (col. 2, lines 1-

5, Stickler). Furthermore, MARS 25 also provides encoding properties defining special

qualities relating to the format, structure or general serialization of data streams (col. 10,

lines 16-18). One of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to make the

aforementioned combination with reasonable expectation of success.

Claim 54 is rejected for the reasons set forth hereinabove for claim 53 and

furthermore Bennion/Grosner/Krishnaprasad/Sarkar/Stickler discloses a computer

readable storage medium comprising:

Wherein the collection element header comprises a collection element type field

and collection element length field (col. 1, lines 56-60, "The data structure defined by

the present invention includes two types of records: data-containing records and

container records. Data-containing records contain data, while container records contain

other records. A code point found at the beginning of each record specifies its type"; col.

5, lines 18-20, "One bit is used to indicate that this is a container record (as opposed to

a data-containing record)", wherein a code point is equivalent to a header and one of

the types is container records, in which case the header is a collection element header

because container records contain other records, which is equivalent to a "collection"

element, and the data itself is the payload, Bennion),

wherein the collection element header comprises a collection element type field

and a collection element length field, wherein the collection element type field indicates

the collection element fragment is a collection element fragment; (col. 5, lines 18-20,

"One bit is used to indicate that this is a container record (as opposed to a data-

containing record)", Bennion), and

wherein the collection element length field indicates a length of the collection

element payload (col. 5, lines 23-25, "For container records, the length field 203

specifies the total length of all records that the current record contains (as described

above)", Bennion).

Conclusion

11.   Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in

this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37

CFR 1.136(a).

        A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Points of Contact

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to GIOVANNA COLAN whose telephone number is (571)272-2752. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 am - 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Breene can be reached on (571) 272-4107. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Giovanna Colan
Examiner
Art Unit 2162
May 6, 2009

/John Breene/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2162